

Village of Lansing

Planning Board Meeting

November 30, 1999

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Brown, Dankert (Alternate), Halevy, Klepack, Waterman, Village Attorney Marcus, Code Enforcement Officer Curtis, Village Engineer Cross, and Trustee Liaison Leopold.

Public Comment

Waterman moved to close the Public Comment portion of the meeting as there was no one present who wished to speak. Seconded by Klepack . All in favor.

Hickey announced that Pyramid Mall will not be on the agenda for this meeting because they have not yet provided the Board with the final traffic analysis. They will be on the agenda for the December 13 meeting.

Gesslein/Goldberg Subdivision - Public Hearing

Preliminary and Final Plat approval of a major subdivision by George Gesslein and Mark Goldberg involving boundary line changes and the conveyance of approximately .353 acres from the parcel known as 1 Churchill Drive to an adjoining vacant parcel, as well as the transference of approximately .147 acres to the Village of Lansing to construct a turn-around at the end of Churchill Drive. The two residential parcels are in the Medium Density Residential District, Tax Parcel Numbers 46.1-1-3.42 and 46.1-1-3.32.

Hickey opened the Public Hearing. As no one wished to speak, Brown moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Waterman. All in favor.

Klepack moved to approve the Gesslein/Goldberg Subdivision with the condition that parcel A will be merged with the parcel immediately to the south and the line between the two parcels will be eliminated. Seconded by Waterman. All in favor.

McDonalds Special Permit - Public Hearing

Special Permit #1501, McDonalds Corporation to construct a one story 3,791 s.f. restaurant with drive-thru window at 2350 N. Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel Number 47.1-1-17.82. This construction involves the relocation of a pre-existing non-conforming use pursuant to sections 202.07 and 304.06 of the Village of Lansing Zoning Law.

Hickey said that the impetus for this move is an attempt to resolve the traffic problems that exist with the current McDonalds by moving it across the street to a larger lot which will provide more parking area and more stacking room. One of the provisions of the amendment to the Zoning Law that permits this specifically stresses that all of the parking must be on the lot of the new site. There can be no parking in front of the site adjacent to Triphammer Road so the lot will have to provide enough parking for all types of vehicles, including trucks and buses. Hickey opened the Public Hearing. As no one wished to speak, Halevy moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Klepack. All in favor.

Francis Essien was present at the meeting to represent McDonalds and gave an overview of the proposal. He first noted that the square footage has now been increased to 4,033 s.f. due to the requirement to provide handicapped accessible facilities. He said that this facility will resolve the parking issues that they are experiencing on the existing site. The site is approximately an acre, but a good portion of the site would be used as green space and for drainage. They propose to have only one curb cut on Triphammer Road for ingress and egress. There will be 60 parking spaces as well as other paved areas that trucks and other large vehicles can use. They now have only 32 or 33 parking spaces which does not meet their capacity needs. Three handicapped parking spaces will be provided. The site itself drops toward the rear so they would have to build up a retaining wall at least 10 feet high. At the next meeting they will

address utility related concerns, storm water retention, sewer capacity, lighting plan and landscaping plan.

The Board had a copy of the Creighton Manning traffic study done for McDonalds as well as the review of that study done by Mr. Napoleon. Kenneth Wersted from Creighton Manning led the Board through the traffic study. The intersections that they looked at were N. Triphammer Road and Graham Road, and also Pyramid Drive at both the noon peak hour and p.m. and also the afternoon peak hours for Saturday. Counts were done earlier in the year when school was in session, and those counts were the basis for all of their future traffic predictions. Looking at the existing facilities in terms of Triphammer Road, they counted 300 trips (total of 300 vehicles) in the noon peak hour coming in and out of the existing McDonalds. In the p.m. there were 160 and 120 on Saturday. The problem with that site is that traffic cannot always get into the site and the drive-thru line backs up on Triphammer Road. This prevents vehicles from entering the site, and if they do enter the site they won't necessarily find a parking spot. Another issue is people parking in front of the site. They figured a 20% increase in customers as a result of moving across the street. On Triphammer Road they project an increase of 30 trips during the noon peak hours or 360 trips. Hickey noted that the restaurant will increase in size by 60% and in Mr. Napoleon's review he felt that that 20% is not high enough, but he also said that raising it probably wouldn't make any difference in the facilities. Wersted said that part of that increase is based on an ITE forecast for the size of the restaurant, however the existing facility is generating about 90% higher than what the ITE says because it's the only McDonalds in the area. They also considered an estimate of the annual growth in business.

They predict at the noon peak hour to see 38 vehicles turning into the site from the north and 144 coming from the south, 64 vehicles exiting the site turning left (north) and 114 exiting by turning right and heading south. For this particular count, the impact on the level of service at the Graham Road intersection is negligible. However, that intersection is not operating very well right now and Tops has agreed to install a signal. Hickey pointed out that the level of service at the noon hour on Friday for the existing traffic making a left hand turn going north on Triphammer Road is level E, and that is not acceptable. Creighton Manning will need to calculate the impact of the light going in at that intersection on that E level of service. Hickey said that if there is going to be a 2.5% per annum increase in traffic and the level of service is already at E and we can't make a better improvement in traffic at this time then we might as well not make the move. The level of service from the Tops study with the light is C. Cross said that the question then is how much will McDonalds affect the C downward.

Hickey asked how the new light will affect the gap study used by Creighton Manning to soften the E level of service. The gap study shows that there are enough gaps in traffic to allow people exiting to make that left hand turn. Wersted explained that the light would create a platoon effect of an organized group of vehicles moving past the site, so that cars that are normally spaced out now move in a group, leaving longer gaps after the group has passed. Hickey said that the only reliability of a gap study such as this would have to come from experience and asked him if gap studies have proved to be reliable in the past. Wersted felt that they were reliable.

Hickey said that it is hard for the Board to accept this traffic study. It was done earlier in the year, before Tops, and there is now a growth factor from Tops and there may be a growth factor from Pyramid Mall. Even if a new light is installed at Graham Road, there still may not be an acceptable traffic situation as a result of putting McDonalds across the street. The Board needs more up to date information such as the impact that the Graham Road light will have on the level of service on northbound traffic at noontime coming out of McDonalds.

Klepack pointed out that the Creighton Manning traffic study talks about the new driveway being 135 feet south of the current one, whereas the full report talks about the new driveway being relocated directly across. The Creighton Manning report points out several advantages of having it farther south and the Napoleon report points out several advantages of having it farther north.

Halevy asked why they used the more conservative 50% passby figure rather than using the high figure that the McDonalds industry uses. A passby trip is a made by someone that passes by the site usually every day on a typical route and they decide to stop at McDonalds. They travel this route every day and are not new to the area. However, if someone makes a special trip to go to McDonalds and it's not on their usual route, that's a primary trip or a new trip. Different facilities have different passby percentages. The food service industry typically predicts a higher passby percentage than the ITE. The ITE says it's about 50 % and by using that more conservative figure the prediction is that

there will be more new trips to the facility and not just a higher percentage of passby traffic.

Klepack noted that the most alarming thing Napoleon mentioned is passing on the right. Wersted said that the level of service for a left turn coming in is A, so turning into the site is not going to be a problem.

Curtis asked about how the stacking was figured. His understanding of the rating system is that it's based on a period of delay and he was wondering in calculating the stacking on the site at what level the exit intersection has to be in order to maintain the flow of the cars. Creighton Manning said that it's a level E coming out for a left hand turn, or a 30 second delay. Curtis said it would be helpful to know what that turn delay has to be at in order to avoid backing the whole thing up.

Marcus said that McDonalds needed to provide the Board with some kind of confirmation that there will not be a plug at the exit. Marcus summarized that Creighton Manning had said that the current situation results in a greater volume than ITE figures for that location and that the higher volume of business anticipated at the new site is in part because people will now be able to stop who previously had forgone stopping because of traffic congestion. An increase in volume is also anticipated because McDonalds will have a bigger facility. Marcus asked if the trip generation figures in excess of the standard for the proposed site - whether it's ITE or a standard that McDonalds has developed from past experience - to accommodate all the different factors that they are projecting will increase volume. It sounds like the increase should be more than 20%.

Hickey added that if they are using the planning figure of 20%, it would seem that the same figure should be used to estimate what the growth in business is going to be and what the growth in traffic is going to be. If Creighton Manning is saying that in the future McDonalds plans on getting a 20% growth in business, the facilities need to be able to handle the 20% growth.

Hickey said that he found a formula from the Northwestern Institute of Traffic Studies for determining stacking needs: take the number of cars at a peak hour going in (182 at 12 noon on a Friday according to Creighton Manning), and then determine how much of that is going to be drive-thru (60% according to Creighton Manning), and then take 60% of that number and divide it by 4 because you want a 15 minute interval and multiply it by 20 feet and you come out with 540 feet of stacking. Creighton Manning's figure was 400 feet. Hickey asked that they look at this because he wants to be sure that the stacking doesn't go out into Triphammer Road. He also noted that 2% of the traffic in Creighton Manning's study is heavy trucks and the site plan has no provision to park those trucks in that parking area. Hickey said that there needs to be a designated truck parking area on the site plan.

It was asked whether increasing the seating capacity to 80 seats will have an impact on the percentage of drive-thru business. Creighton Manning said it is possible that it could drop to between 49% and 53%. Hickey asked that they get the percentage from McDonalds of similar size restaurants.

Cross said that they would need some construction details on the retaining wall and there will need to be a guard rail at the top.

There will be approximately 8 employees per shift and some of the 60 parking places will be devoted to employees. Hickey asked for an estimate of how many parking spaces they think will be needed by employees so they can see how many will be left for customers. Hickey suggested locating the handicapped parking spaces so that drivers won't have to back out into the drive thru line.

The Board also pointed out that there is no plan shown for pedestrian circulation. Hickey would like to see sidewalks on either side of the driveway or somewhere else so that they can hook up with sidewalk on Triphammer Road.

Andy Sciarabba expressed concern about the retaining wall because visibility of his building from the street will be reduced. Essien said that the retaining wall will not be uniform height throughout and can be addressed so that it's not necessarily too high. Once they have a grading plan they will have a better idea of what it will look like. .

When McDonalds vacates the old site, they will be required to restore the site so it can be used for CLT use. The southernmost driveway will be closed and the McDonalds trademarks will be removed. Hickey said that the Board will

need to see a letter or some plans on that.

The site plan should show signage and comments about lighting. Signage issues will need to be worked through as a separate issue and will not part of the special permit approval. McDonalds will be held to the new Sign Law which was not in effect when the original McDonalds was established.

Marcus said that it would be appropriate for the Board to add to the site plan a line that would define the limit of the N. Triphammer Road reconstruction so that they can be sure that they will not be interfering with the edge of the parking lot. The Board doesn't want to be in a situation where part of McDonald's parking lot or the radii of their driveway will need to be reconstructed. There should be a line showing the limit of what the Village would acquire according to the current plans. This can be coordinated with David Herrick of T.G. Miller Engineers.

Hickey suggested that an outside eating area might be a nice addition.

Curtis pointed out that a lot of school buses go to McDonalds, and perhaps a proportionally higher percentage at this location. Currently the buses park along the road, but once the move takes place buses can no longer be parked on the road. Hickey asked that they look hard at the school bus parking and maybe come up with a better solution for handicapped parking as well.

YMCA Addition - Developers Conference Architect Bob Tallman and YMCA's Executive Director, Paul Grennell, were present at the meeting to present the proposal to add locker rooms, a child care center, youth activity rooms, a gymnasium and multi-purpose rooms to the YMCA. They are proposing to add about 23,000 s.f. and 65 parking spaces and they are also considering changing the driveway configuration. There is a circle around a flag pole in front of the main entrance which vehicles need to go around to exit at the northern driveway. It's very difficult for buses to get around the flag pole so they are contemplating putting another opening on Butler Road so there will be a rotary pattern around the flagpole and another opening onto Butler to access the new 65 spaces to the north. This will ease some of the traffic around the front entrance. This is what the original plans called for, but due to lack of funding only one driveway was put in. The 65 additional spaces do take into account the 20% reduction. Hickey said that the area to be set aside for the 20% reduction should be shown on the map. The YMCA averages between 45-50 cars at peak times; and occasionally as high as 80. The only way they would ever fill their capacity would be if they had 2 or 3 events at the same time..

Phase I will be the locker rooms and multi-purpose rooms and Phase II will be the gymnasium. They discussed with the Board where the sidewalk would go, and felt that in view of the planned sidewalks along the west side of Butler Road that will connect to the shoulders on Hickory Hollow Road, they would probably carry the sidewalk around the south side of the existing parking area. Hickey said that it would be nice to have a trail on the McDonalds property where the drainage area connects into Pyramid so kids could go from the YMCA to McDonalds.

On the floor plan they pointed out the gym which will accommodate a full sized basketball court and running east and west will be two elementary school sized basketball courts or three volley ball courts. The gym overall is 132 feet x 85 feet and to the south is the youth activity area - youth locker rooms and child care center with an activity room above that. There will be more programs and there will be an increase in membership but the type of operation will not change. What they are really adding to the operation is family programs where there is more opportunity for adults and kids to do things together. With the gymnasium, family activities will increase tremendously.

Hickey said that since they are putting in more toilets they need to look at their water consumption and need for sewer permits.

They will be put on the January 10, 2000 agenda.

Environmental Design and Research

Klepack said that they now have list of about 25 people committed to coming to the focus group meetings. Bonnie

Majestic has asked for this list to see if she can identify any under-represented groups. At the first focus group meeting, EDR plans to present a slide show to show what can be accomplished. They will also pose some general questions to get feedback and develop some kind of time line.

Squeaky Clean Carwash Sign Proposal

Curtis said that since Sloan's proposal is for a sign which is not permitted in the Sign Law, there are three avenues to address the issue: 1) As this type of sign is substantially distinct from other types of signs regulated in the existing Sign Law, the Board could decide that it warranted some special provision and write an amendment to a Sign Law. 2) Sloan can apply to the BZA for a variance. The existing variance that was granted allowed Sloan to have a different configuration for his signs as long as he stayed within the 110 s.f. permitted for that use. It may be that he can ask for a reconfiguration of the signage to include the reader board and still stay within the 110 s.f. or he could ask for more signage. 3) He can join a contiguous Planned Sign Area such as Sciarabba's. Sloan would need to request that the Planned Sign Area be amended and provide the rationale and the mitigation consistent with Article 6, Section 3 which requires that he demonstrates that he is accomplishing things such as uniformity of site, and that he is proposing landscaping or some other factor that would offset the impact of the signage

Board members felt that amending the Sign Law would set a bad precedent and that this type of signage would be unsafe. Marcus added that given the way the Sign Law works, this would really be equivalent to saying to somebody that they can put up more signs for their business as long as they only have them up half the year. Hickey said that the purpose of the Sign Law is to encourage sound practices and lessen the objectionable effects or competition in respect to size and placement of signs and some of the goals of the Sign Law are equality, reduction of distractions, and aesthetic appreciation for the visual environment. Curtis added that a big factor in the BZA's granting of the variance was that he was not increasing the total square footage of signage. Hickey said the Board was not interested in amending the Sign Law.

Minutes

Halevy moved to approve the October 20, October 26, and November 8 minutes as amended. Waterman seconded. All in favor.

Adjourn

Waterman moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m. Halevy seconded. All in favor.

"